



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

40

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/070,908	05/04/98	SAKAMA	M 0756-1799

IM22/1011  
SIXBY FRIEDMAN LEEDOM & FERGUSON  
2010 CORPORATE RIDGE  
SUTIE 600  
MCLEAN VA 22102

EXAMINER	
PADGETT, M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1762	16

DATE MAILED: 10/11/00

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application

## COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

## ADVISORY ACTION

☒ THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:a) ☒ is extended to run \_\_\_\_\_ or continues to run 3 months from the date of the final rejectionb) ☐ expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

☐ Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).☒ Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed 9/29/00 has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:1. ☒ The proposed amendments to the claim and/or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:a. ☒ There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.b. ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note).c. ☐ They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note).d. ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.e. ☐ They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: In claim 28, having the reactive gas & the flow rate the same is a new issue  
Broadening the scope of claim 24 to a generic material and removing the  
specific deposition process are new issues. In claim 60, made of silicon  
oxide is a different scope from the open language "comprises silicon oxide."  
Claims 92 and 99 have had significant amount of limitations added thereto

2. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.3. ☐ Upon the filing an appeal, the proposed amendment ☐ will be entered ☐ will not be entered and the status of the claims will be as follows:

Claims allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claims objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claims rejected: \_\_\_\_\_

However,

☒ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): Some are 112 issues are resolved, but  
created new issues in correcting them4. ☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcome the rejection because the new issues  
need to be further considered.5. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not shown good and sufficient reasons why it was not earlier presented.☐ The proposed drawing correction ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the examiner.☐ OtherMARIANNE PADGETT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1700